

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

COMPASS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ZILLOW, INC., ZILLOW GROUP, INC., and
TRULIA, LLC

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-05201-JAV

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF COMPASS, INC.’S
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Plaintiff Compass, Inc., (“Plaintiff”), having filed its Complaint and its Motion for a Preliminary Injunction (“Motion,”) and the Court having considered Plaintiff’s Motion, the papers submitted on the Motion, the papers on file in this case, and the argument and evidence presented in the evidentiary hearing, hereby finds as follows, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(a):

Plaintiff has demonstrated that it will suffer irreparable harm if no preliminary injunction is issued during the pendency of this case, including loss of its competitive advantage, harm to reputation, lost business opportunity, and lost goodwill, and that competition and consumers will also suffer irreparable harm.

Plaintiff has further demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits of its claims under Section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 1) and Section 2 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. § 2) by showing that it is more likely than not that Defendants Zillow Inc., Zillow Group, Inc., and Trulia, LLC (“Defendants”), with Redfin and eXp, engaged in a *per se* unlawful group boycott to

follow Defendants' rule banning "pre-marketed" listings; that the residential real estate online search services is a valid relevant market and that Defendants have monopoly power in that market; and that Defendants engaged in unlawful exclusionary conduct.

Plaintiff has also demonstrated that the balance of the hardships is decidedly in its favor, as it will suffer irreparable harm without the injunction while granting of the injunction will cause Defendants little harm.

Plaintiff has finally demonstrated that granting of the injunction is in the public interest, as competition and consumers will suffer irreparable harm without it.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

1. Plaintiff's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction is GRANTED.
2. Defendants are ENJOINED from enforcing any rules which ban listings from their platforms that have been pre-marketed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff has no obligation to post any bond or security in connection with its Motion.
2. No person who has notice of this injunction shall fail to comply with it, nor shall any person subvert the injunction by sham, indirection, or other artifice.

DATED: _____, 2025

United States District Judge